7

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed November 29, 2004. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-21 were pending. Claims 1-21 are rejected. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 6, 8, 15 and 21, and have canceled Claim 20. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 102(e) Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0069272 by Kim, et al. ("*Kim*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons stated below.

With respect to independent Claim 1, as amended, Applicants submit that *Kim* does not teach or suggest "automatically applying a specified set of rules to produce a result set based on the service option selection and the capacity information," "automatically determining that one or more network elements are to be included in the integrated communication server based on the result set," and "automatically determining configuration parameters for the one or more network elements based on the result set."

With reference to FIG. 1 of *Kim, Kim* discloses updating of remote servers having "configuration parameters [that are] stored in a database 34 in the format of a plurality of tables." (*see Kim*, para. 0034) (emphasis added). "When [a] user modifies [a] desired configuration parameter ... the server manager 32 merely updates one or more tables that includes this parameter." (*Id.*) Nowhere in *Kim* is taught or suggested that the tables are updated by automatically applying a specified set of rules; they are just simply updated by a user (i.e., a client 12, 14, or 16 in FIG.1). "Once the one or more tables are updated in the server manager 32, the server manager 32 communicates one or more commands to one or more of the [remote] servers 22, 24, and 26." (*Id.*) [T]he [remote] servers are configured to run a dedicated program .... that is triggered to [simply] retrieve the modified parameter from the updated table. [T]he daemon updates the configuration of the application program with the retrieved parameter." (*Id.*) (emphasis added). Nowhere in *Kim* is taught or suggested that the remote servers 22, 24

8

and 26 are automatically determined to be included in the intranet server 30 based on the result set. In addition, "the daemon, using the parameters from the modified fields of the centralized database, will update or synchronize the server configuration with the updated centralized database fields accordingly." (*Kim*, p.4, para. 0035) (emphasis added). Thus, the configuration parameters for a particular remote server is not automatically determined in *Kim* but merely updated or synchronized by the daemon.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, *Kim* does not does not teach or suggest at least "automatically applying a specified set of rules to produce a result set based on the service option selection and the capacity information," "automatically determining that one or more network elements are to be included in the integrated communication server based on the result set," and "automatically determining configuration parameters for the one or more network elements based on the result set" as recited by amended Claim 1. Thus, *Kim* does not anticipate independent Claim 1. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that amended independent Claims 8, 15 and 21 are allowable for reasons analogous to those above in conjunction with amended Claim 1. Thus, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

In addition, amended Claim 15 is allowable because it recites a "rule engine operable to ... download the network elements from the remote location to a central server associated with the service engine." *Kim* simply does not teach or suggest any downloading of the remote servers 22, 24 and 26 to intranet server 30. For this additional reason, amended Claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 2-7 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 9-14 depend from independent Claim 8, and Claims 16-19 depend from independent Claim 15, and are also not anticipated by *Kim* because they include the limitations of their respective base claim, which are shown above to be allowable, as well as additional limitations that further distinguish *Kim*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-19 be withdrawn.

In addition to depending from independent Claim 1, which is shown above to be allowable, Claim 2 is also allowable because it contains additional limitations not disclosed by *Kim*. For example, Claim 2 recites "receiving provisioning information based on the result set."

9

(Emphasis added). Assuming for the sake of argument that *Kim* teaches receiving provisioning information, this provisioning information is certainly not based on any result set. *Kim* merely updates configuration parameters for a remote server. Thus, for at least this additional reason, *Kim* does not anticipate Claim 2. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 2.

In addition to depending from independent Claim 1, which is shown above to be allowable, Claim 6 is also allowable for reasons analogous to those above in conjunction with Claim 15. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

DAL01:832236.1

10

CONCLUSIONS

For the foregoing reasons and for apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179 of Siemens Information & Communications Products, L.L.C.

Respectfully requested,

Date: _January 25, 2005_

CUSTOMER NUMBER 28524   By: _Thomas George_
SIEMENS CORPORATION   Thomas George
Intellectual Property Department   Registration No. 45,740
170 Wood Avenue South   Attorney for Applicants
Iselin, New Jersey 08830   Tel: 650-694-5191
ATTENTION: Elsa Keller, IP Department   Fax: 650-968-4517
Telephone: (732) 321-3026

DAL01:832236.1

PAGE 10/10 * RCVD AT 1/26/2005 11:03:37 AM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/1 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:6509684517 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-04